

4-12-1979

Meeting Notes 1979-04-12

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Follow this and additional works at: http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_jpact

Recommended Citation

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation, "Meeting Notes 1979-04-12 " (1979). *Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation*. Paper 1.

http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_jpact/1

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. For more information, please contact pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

Agenda

Date: April 12, 1979

Day: Thursday

Time: 7:30 am

Place: Kopper Kitchen

1. VOTING PROCEDURES FOR THE JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
ON TRANSPORTATION (JPACT)

MAJOR ISSUE--Efforts are currently underway to name elected representatives of local governments to sit on JPACT. These representatives should be present when voting procedures are established.

TPAC CONCERNS--Several TPAC members raised concerns:

1. Why isn't TPAC sufficient to ensure local government involvement?
2. What is the role of elected officials on JPACT?
3. What is the selection process to name elected officials?
4. Couldn't some transportation decisions be delegated to JPACT by the Council (with the right for any Councilor to call up an item for full Council action) of selected transportation decisions to reduce attendance by local staff at MSD meetings?
5. How are TPAC recommendations to be presented at JPACT?
6. Are local staff expected to attend JPACT meetings to explain their projects?

TPAC RECOMMENDATIONS--Recommendations were not made by the full committee.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Delay consideration of voting procedures until local elected officials are named to JPACT.
2. Prepare staff recommendation for next JPACT meeting describing the role of TPAC, the role of elected officials on JPACT, possible delegation of transportation decisions to JPACT, and recommended voting procedures for JPACT.

2. FUTURE MEETING SCHEDULE

MAJOR ISSUE--JPACT members should be named prior to establishing a regular meeting schedule.

TPAC CONCERNS--Several TPAC members felt that the early morning meeting time for JPACT would discourage attendance by local staff and elected officials.

TPAC RECOMMENDATION--Recommendations were not made by the full committee.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

1. Do not establish a regular meeting schedule until JPACT members are named.
2. Establish a meeting time for the May meeting of JPACT.
3. Establish a regular meeting schedule at the May meeting.

3. SCHEDULE FOR ADOPTION OF THE AIR QUALITY PLAN

MAJOR ISSUE--Adequate time is needed for a technical review by TPAC.

TPAC CONCERNS--A number of concerns have previously been made by various TPAC members about the SIP.

TPAC RECOMMENDATION--TPAC has established a subcommittee to review and advise them on the SIP. TPAC intends to approve recommendations at their May 10 meeting.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

- . Agree to schedule included in the packet.

4. CITIZEN APPOINTMENT TO THE TPAC

MAJOR ISSUE--Efforts have not been completed as yet to designate citizen representatives to TPAC.

TPAC CONCERNS--The role of citizens on TPAC was unclear to many TPAC members.

TPAC RECOMMENDATION--Recommendations were not made by the full committee.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

- . Establish a special meeting of the Council Transportation Committee to designate committee members for Council consideration.

5. PROCESS FOR ALLOCATING THE MSD INTERSTATE TRANSFER RESERVE

MAJOR ISSUE--The draft process has been rewritten in response to local jurisdiction comments.

TPAC CONCERNS--Several members expressed a desire to define criteria before problems are prioritized (the revised process includes this progression).

TPAC RECOMMENDATION--TPAC recommended that the proposed process be approved by the MSD council.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

- Recommend the process to the full MSD Council. Schedule consideration of criteria at the May meeting.

6. CITY OF PORTLAND REQUEST TO FUND PE ON THE SOUTH PORTLAND CIRCULATION PROJECT

MAJOR ISSUE--Issues to be considered in the PE study are described in the attached Systems Planning Report.

TPAC CONCERNS--A question was raised about the adequacy of the funds to complete PE.

TPAC RECOMMENDATION--TPAC recommended the proposed resolution be approved.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

- Recommend the Council approve the proposed resolution.

7. COST OVERRUNS ON HWY 212 AND PROGRESS RAMPS

MAJOR ISSUE--Issues are addressed in the Management Summaries.

TPAC CONCERNS--A question was raised about which contingency funds were being used (a number of contingency funds have been established).

TPAC RECOMMENDATION--Recommend the resolutions be approved by the full council.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

- Prepare a staff paper describing the various contingency accounts. Recommend the approval of the resolutions.

8. FY 1980 UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM (UWP)

MAJOR ISSUE--The draft UWP is to be reviewed by TPAC over the coming month. Issues will be addressed prior to TPAC's action in May.

TPAC CONCERNS--TPAC's concerns will be addressed at their May meeting.

TPAC RECOMMENDATION--Recommendations have not been made by TPAC as yet.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

- . Action by the Council Transportation Committee is not requested at this time. Schedule approval of UWP (as revised) for the May meeting.

9. TIP AMENDMENT TO FUND REPOWERING OF 200 BUSES

MAJOR ISSUE--Issues have not been raised.

TPAC CONCERNS--Concerns were not raised by TPAC members

TPAC RECOMMENDATION--Approval of the TIP amendment

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

- . Recommend amendment of the TIP to include funding of project.

MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: April 12, 1979

SUBJECT: Meeting of the Transportation Committee of the Council

IN ATTENDANCE:

- . Council Transportation Committee: Charlie Williamson (chairman), Donna Stuhr, Betty Schedeen
- . Implementation Agency Representatives: Bill Young (DEQ), Bob Bothman (ODOT), Dick Carroll (WSDOT), John Frewing (Tri-Met), Ken Johnson (Port of Portland)
- . Others: Bebe Rucker, Ted Spence, Bill Ockert, Gary Spanovich, Laurel Wentworth, Paul Bay, Karen Thackston

Charlie Williamson called the meeting to order and asked everyone to introduce themselves.

He explained the reason for establishing a joint transportation committee, what it will be involved in, and what it will try to accomplish.

I. Voting Procedures for the Joint Policy Advisory Committee for Transportation (JPACT)

Bill Ockert explained the TPAC concerns about their role, the role of elected officials, the role of citizens on TPAC, voting procedures, etc. Charlie Williamson offered to meet with TPAC at its next meeting in May to discuss these concerns.

The Committee approved the staff recommendation to 1) delay action on voting procedures until the local elected officials are chosen and 2) asking staff to prepare a report on the roles of the various committees, delegation of decisions, and possible voting procedures.

Dick Carroll, WSDOT, suggested that an effort be made to explain to Vancouver and Clark County officials how they would relate to the transportation committee. Charlie Williamson suggested that he and Mike Burton talk to Vancouver and Clark County officials.

II. Future Meeting Schedule--The decision as to a permanent location and schedule for the JPACT meeting will be put off until elected officials are named.

The May meeting will be held Thursday, May 10, at 7:30 a.m. Karen Thackston will notify members of the location.

III. Air Quality State Implementation Plan (SIP)

Bill Ockert explained the delay in releasing the SIP for review and comment. He explained that because of the short review time TPAC had named a subcommittee to review the draft plan and prepare recommendations for TPAC consideration in May.

Paul Bay commented that he felt TPAC should concentrate on uncovering policy issues and bring them to JPACT. He suggested that JPACT be made aware of any trade-offs.

No action was required.

IV. Citizen Appointments to TPAC--

Solicitation of citizen members has begun. Mr. Williamson felt that in light of TPAC concerns about citizen roles on TPAC he would meet with them before going any further with the citizen selection.

V. Process for Allocating the MSD Interstate Transfer Reserve

Bill Ockert explained that the proposed process had been reviewed with the jurisdictions and that jurisdictional concerns were addressed in the final draft. He stated that TPAC was concerned with the criteria and its development.

Bill Young felt that problems should not be fully identified until criteria have been established. The Committee asked that the flow chart be redone to show the criteria being developed at the same time as problems are identified. With that change, the proposed process was agreed to by the Committee. Staff will prepare draft criteria and describe the types of problems being proposed at the May meeting. Criteria are scheduled for approval at the June meeting of the Council.

VI. City of Portland Request to Fund PE on the South Portland Project

As per requirements, staff has developed a systems planning report on this project which identifies objectives to be met by the project, the potential effectiveness of the project, and the effect of the project on the regional transportation system. City staff agrees with the report. Laurel Wentworth stated that the project ties in with many of the regional projects being developed on the Westside. Concerns were raised as to consistency with transit corridors and its impact on the Interstate system.

Donna Stuhr asked if there were any policy implications. Bill Ockert said that the major policy consideration is the commitment of Interstate Transfer funds to the project. The City of Portland intends to request I-505 withdrawal funds to build the project. The Committee approved forwarding the project to the full Council.

VII. Cost Overruns

1. Hwy 212
Using \$58,000 of the contingency fund set aside for Clackamas County/Clackamas County cities.
2. Progress Ramps
Using \$75,250 of the contingency fund set aside for FAU projects.

Discussion centered on notification of the jurisdictions that might later wish to use a contingency account that consideration is being given to drawing down an account. Bebe Rucker stated that the representatives of those jurisdictions were at the TIP Subcommittee meeting and TPAC and that they voted for use of the contingency on these projects.

The Committee approved the use of the contingency funds and directed staff in the future to directly notify jurisdictions that might later desire to use a contingency fund.

Bob Bothman requested that the Progress ramps be sent to the Council that evening so as not to delay construction. The Committee agreed.

VIII. FY 1980 Unified Work Program (UWP)

Bill Ockert explained the purpose of the UWP. He pointed out this would be an action item in May so that it can be adopted with the MSD budget.

IX. TIP Amendment to Fund Repowering of Zoo Buses.

Paul Bay explained that it is more cost effective to repower buses than to buy all new ones. Tri-Met is proposing to use UMTA Section 5 funds.

The Committee approved the TIP Amendment for forwarding to the Council.

X. May Agenda Suggestions:

John Frewing suggested the following items be considered at the May meeting:

- . Fuel Shortage Plan
- . Computer Purchases

CWO:bc
3287A
D/3

Metropolitan Service District

527 SW Hall Portland, Oregon 97201 503/221-1646

Memorandum

Date: April 3, 1979

To: Local Officials Advisory Committee

From: Charles Williamson, ^{ew}Chairman, MSD Transportation Committee

Subject: Involvement of Local Elected Officials in Regional Transportation Matters

The MSD Council has established a Transportation Committee to review transportation/air quality matters and make recommendations to the full Council. It is the desire of the MSD Transportation Committee to work closely with elected officials of local general purpose governments and policy-level representatives of agencies responsible for implementing transportation plans. To accomplish this objective, a Joint Policy Advisory Committee is being formed composed of members of the MSD Transportation Committee, elected officials of affected local jurisdictions, representatives of implementation agencies, and representatives from the state of Washington. The purpose of this memo is to ask your assistance in selecting local elected officials to sit on the joint committee. By separate letters, I have invited representatives from implementation agencies and the state of Washington. In addition to satisfying our desire for a close working relationship between policy-level officials involved in regional transportation matters, such a joint committee will provide the mechanism to satisfy federal requirements for a cooperative transportation planning process.

While we feel you should be afforded a great amount of flexibility in designating local elected officials to sit on the joint committee, we have a few suggestions for your consideration. First, it appears that the local elected officials sitting on the Joint Policy Advisory Committee should be considered a subcommittee of the Local Elected Officials Advisory Committee. Five to seven elected officials would be appropriate. Geographic representation should be a concern. Rather than designating specific elected officials, you may wish to designate specific jurisdictions or groups of jurisdictions to be represented and depend on the designated jurisdiction(s) to name their specific representative.

Memorandum

Page 2

We anticipate that a number of critical transportation issues will be coming before MSD. Among them are the allocation of the \$20 million Interstate Reserve fund, agreement on an air quality control strategy, designation of corridors appearing to warrant investment in fixed guideway transit facilities as well as modal and route alternatives, and approval of a new regional transportation plan. As you can see, decisions on these and other transportation matters are crucial to the future of our region.

Our next meeting is at 7:30 a.m. on April 12, 1979. If possible, we would like to see local elected officials at this meeting. Subsequently, we are anticipating monthly meetings to consider transportation items.

Thank you for your consideration.

CWO:bc
3092A
D/1